



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/822,432	04/12/2004	Jean-Luc Collet	FR920030018US1	2549
45095 7590 03/31/2011 HOFFMAN WARNICK LLC 75 STATE ST 14 FL ALBANY, NY 12207				
EXAMINER MADAMBA, GLENFORD J				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2451				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/31/2011		ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTOCommunications@hoffmanwarnick.com

**Office Action Summary****Application No.**

10/822,432

**Applicant(s)**

COLLET ET AL.

**Examiner**

Glenford Madamba

**Art Unit**

2451

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 January 2011.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-14 and 16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-14 and 16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-940)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB-08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is in response to remarks filed by Applicant's representative on January 11, 2011.

#### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on January 11, 2011 has been entered.

#### ***Response to Remarks and Amendments***

1. Applicant's claim amendments and associated comments filed on January 11, 2011 have been fully considered, but are now moot in light of the new grounds of rejection provided with this action.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claim 1, 3-14 and 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nielsen, U.S. Patent 5,870,548 in view of Leonard et al (hereinafter Leonard), U.S. Patent 6,721,784 and in further view of Kucherauw, U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0028580 A1 and Lewis, U.S. Patent 7,793,334 B2.

As per claim 1, Nielsen in view of Leonard discloses a system for enabling the cancellation of a previously-sent e-mail [Abstract], comprising a data transmission network, wherein a plurality of users are connected to said network [Figs. 1a-b & 2], each of said users being able as a sender (200) to send an e-mail (i.e., 'email') over said network to a plurality of users as recipients connected to said network (202), and wherein a message transfer agent (MTA) (203/207) is associated with each of said users for sending the e-mail when said user acts as a sender and delivering the e-mail when said user acts as a recipient [Fig. 2].

wherein each MTA includes a cancel mailbox (e.g., sender's outbox\_204) for transmitting a cancellation message (i.e., "cancellation message") [col 4, L37-47] to said recipients when the user associated with said MTA is a sender wanting to cancel a previously-sent e-mail (i.e., "previously sent email") or for managing the cancellation of e-mails in the mailbox of the user associated with said MTA upon receiving said cancellation message from said sender when this user is a recipient [col 3, L5-50] [col 3, L56 – col 4, L3],

But while Nielsen discloses substantial features of the invention such as the system of claim 1, the added feature of the process wherein the cancel mailbox of each MTA is configured to cancel the e-mail sent to the recipients only when none of the recipients has read the e-mail, and is configured to not delete the e-mail when any of said recipients has read said email, is expressly disclosed by Leonard in a related endeavor.

Leonard discloses as his invention an electronic mail system and method in which the originator or sender may control the lifespan of the message, so that the message, and all copies of the messages everywhere in the world, disappear at an appropriate time [col 9, L10-15]. In particular, Leonard discloses the added feature of the process wherein the cancel mailbox of each MTA is configured to cancel the e-mail sent to the recipients only when none of the recipients has read the e-mail, and is configured to not delete the e-mail when any of said recipients has read said email. (e.g., tracking the messages of "individuals or groups of recipients" to whom the

message have been sent) [Abstract] [col 1, L60-62] (e.g., groups of clients) [col 5, L40 – col 6, L10] [col 10, L19-28]. As disclosed and taught by Leonard, a 'recipient' of the electronic messaging or mail system may be embodied as an 'individual recipient' or a 'group of recipients', the electronic mail system tracking information concerning the usage (i.e., message 'read' and/or 'deleted') and handling of the message by all recipients.

It would thus be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine and/or modify Nielsen's invention with the above additional feature, as disclosed by Leonard, for the motivation of providing an electronic mail system and method that enables the originator of a message sent by the electronic mail to select a date, time, or event at which the message and all incarnations of the message to self-destruct regardless of the number and types of computers or software systems that may have interacted with the message, and/or to include processing and handling limitations [Abstract].

Further, while the combination of Nielsen and Leonard discloses substantial features of the invention as above, the combination does not explicitly disclose that added feature of the system further comprising "an intermediate MTA, different than the MTA associated with the sender and the MTA associated with any of the recipients, and responsible for a specific domain name or for a distribution list, between the MTA associated with the sender and the MTA associated with any of the recipients".

Nonetheless, the said feature is expressly disclosed by Kucherauw in a related endeavor.

Kucherauw discloses as his invention an email system with methodology for accelerating mass mailings. The email system comprises a Mass-mail accelerator (MMA), which is particularly suited for mass mailings. Instead of being posted to a Message Transfer Agent (MTA), outgoing messages are instead passed to the MMA for carrying out highly parallel email delivery / routing [Abstract] [Fig. 4] [0042]. In particular, Kucherauw discloses the added feature of the system further comprising "an intermediate MTA, different than the MTA associated with the sender and the MTA associated with any of the recipients and responsible for a specific domain name or for a distribution list, between the MTA associated with the sender and the MTA associated with any of the recipients" (Kucherauw: e.g., explicitly discloses and illustrates an intermediate device separate comprising one or more MTAs, such as a 'Mass-Mail Accelerator' \_430, comprising a plurality MTAs\_520, and grouped / categorized according to a 'domain' {i.e., AOL.com Domain}, and wherein the plurality of MTAs\_520 are different than the MTA associated with the sender {MTA\_420} and the MTA associated with a recipient / target) [Figs. 4 & 5] [0042-0046].

It would thus be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combination of Nielsen and Leonard with the above additional feature, as disclosed by Kucherauw, for the motivation of providing an improved methodology for processing automated email messages sent to numerous recipients [Kucherauw: 0004], as well as an email system that implements parallel processing for

mass mailings, with as much resource sharing and re-use, and as little disk I/O, as possible [Kuchera: 0036].

Additionally, while the combination of Nielsen and Leonard and Kuchera discloses substantial features of the invention, including a message transfer agent associated with each of said users for sending the e-mail when said user acts as a sender and delivering the e-mail when said user acts as a recipient, and wherein each MTA includes a cancel mailbox, as above, the combination does not explicitly disclose the added feature of the system further comprising "the intermediate MTA including a cancel mailbox different than the cancel mailbox of the MTA associated with the sender and the cancel mailbox of the MTA associated with any of the recipients, the cancel mailbox of the intermediate MTA receiving the cancellation message from the MTA associated with the sender and, in response, transmitting the cancellation message to the MTA associated with each recipient". Nonetheless, the said feature is expressly disclosed by Lewis in a related endeavor.

Lewis discloses as his invention a system and method for password protecting a subscriber-created distribution list in a wireless network. The method includes receiving a subscriber-created password and a distribution list of a plurality of destination addresses, storing the distribution list and the subscriber-created password in a data structure within the wireless network, associating the subscriber-created password with the distribution list, and limiting access to the distribution list based on the subscriber-created password [Abstract] [Fig. 35] [col 2, L24-54]. In particular, Lewis discloses the added feature of the system further comprising "the intermediate MTA including a



cancel mailbox different than the cancel mailbox of the MTA associated with the sender and the cancel mailbox of the MTA associated with any of the recipients, the cancel mailbox of the intermediate MTA receiving the cancellation message from the MTA associated with the sender and, in response, transmitting the cancellation message to the MTA associated with each recipient" (Lewis: e.g., explicitly discloses and illustrates an intermediate Message Transfer Gateway device {MTG\_170} comprising Message Transfer Agent \_2420 and coupled to various devices including DART1\_145a) [Fig. 24] [col 7, L35-41] (e.g., expressly teaches that "DARTs, such as DART1\_145a / DART2\_145b may be capable of allowing a user to remotely delete email from a wireless device. In this manner, a wireless subscriber may be able to access his wireless device and be able to 'delete', for example, an email message"... "DART 145a may receive a 'delete command' from a wireless subscriber and may be able 'to delete a particular message' from devices such as MDS 150a as well as from an IMAP / POP server 156. In this manner, DART 145a may be capable of 'synchronized delete function'..." [col 19, L1-20 & L38-52] (e.g., "a wireless subscriber may access 'a message that has already been sent to a destination' and can, for example, resend, forward, query or 'delete' this message..." [col 22, L60 – col 23, L5].

It would thus be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combination of Nielsen, Leonard and Kucherawy with the above additional feature, as disclosed by Lewis, for the motivation of providing system and method that provides increased access to a messaging system, and which also

provides an improved set of functions with which customers may be able to interact with the system [Lewis: col 2, L1-20].

As per claim 3, Nielsen discloses the system according to claim 1, wherein the cancel mailbox in each said MTA is associated with a cancellation agent for managing the cancellation of said e-mail, said cancellation agent building a delete process table giving a status of said e-mail during the cancellation process managed by said cancellation agent (e.g., 863 / 865) [Fig. 8D] (e.g., 'Delete Effectuated Message\_1017') [Fig. 10a].

As per claim 4, Nielsen discloses substantial features of the invention, such as a process for canceling a previously-sent e-mail in a system comprising a data transmission network, wherein a plurality of users are connected to said network, each of said users being able as a sender to forward an e-mail over said network to a plurality of users as a recipient connected to said network, and wherein a message transfer agent (MTA) is associated with each of said users for sending the e-mail when said user acts as a sender and delivering the e-mail when said user acts as a recipient [col 3, L5-50] [col 3, L56 – col 4, L3] [Figs. 1a-b & 2]; said process comprising:

- a) sending from said sender a message for deleting said e-mail to a cancel mailbox included in said sender MTA (409) [Fig. 4],

- b) sending from said cancel mailbox included in the sender MTA a message to a cancel mailbox included in each MTA respectively associated with each recipient being

addressed in said e-mail in order to inform the recipients that said e-mail has to be deleted if it is not yet read (1011 & 1017) [Fig. 10a] [col 4, L38-42],

c) sending from said cancel mailboxes of said MTAs respectively associated with said recipients a message requesting that said e-mail has to be masked only if it has not yet been read (1011 & 1017) [Fig. 10a] [col 4, L38-42], and

d) deleting said masked e-mail only when none of said recipients has read said e-mail (1011 & 1017) [Fig. 10a] [col 4, L38-42], and not deleting the masked e-mail when any of said recipients has read said e-mail.

But while Nielsen discloses substantial features of the invention as above, the added feature of the process further comprising deleting said masked e-mail only when none of said recipients has read said e-mail, and not deleting the masked e-mail when any of said recipients has read said e-mail is expressly disclosed by Leonard in a related endeavor.

Leonard discloses as his invention an electronic mail system and method in which the originator or sender may control the lifespan of the message, so that the message, and all copies of the messages everywhere in the world, disappear at an appropriate time [col 9, L10-15]. In particular, Leonard discloses the added feature of the process deleting said masked e-mail only when none of said recipients has read said e-mail, and not deleting the masked e-mail when any of said recipients has read said e-mail (e.g., tracking the messages of "individuals or groups of recipients" to whom the message have been sent) [Abstract] [col 1, L60-62] (e.g., groups of clients)

[col 5, L40 – col 6, L10] [col 10, L19-28]. As disclosed and taught by Leonard, a 'recipient' of the electronic messaging or mail system may be embodied as an 'individual recipient' or a 'group of recipients', the electronic mail system tracking information concerning the usage (i.e., message 'read' and/or 'deleted') and handling of the message by all recipients.

It would thus be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine and/or modify Nielsen's invention with the above additional feature, as disclosed by Leonard, for the motivation of providing an electronic mail system and method that enables the originator of a message sent by the electronic mail to select a date, time, or event at which the message and all incarnations of the message to self-destruct regardless of the number and types of computers or software systems that may have interacted with the message, and/or to include processing and handling limitations [Abstract].

Further, while the combination of Nielsen and Leonard discloses substantial features of the invention as above, the combination does not explicitly disclose that added feature of the system further comprising "an intermediate MTA, different than the MTA associated with the sender and the MTA associated with any of the recipients, and responsible for a specific domain name or for a distribution list, between the MTA associated with the sender and the MTA associated with any of the recipients". Nonetheless, the said feature is expressly disclosed by Kucherawy in a related endeavor.

Kucherauw discloses as his invention an email system with methodology for accelerating mass mailings. The email system comprises a Mass-mail accelerator (MMA), which is particularly suited for mass mailings. Instead of being posted to a Message Transfer Agent (MTA), outgoing messages are instead passed to the MMA for carrying out highly parallel email delivery / routing [Abstract] [Fig. 4] [0042]. In particular, Kucherauw discloses the added feature of the system further comprising "an intermediate MTA, different than the MTA associated with the sender and the MTA associated with any of the recipients and responsible for a specific domain name or for a distribution list, between the MTA associated with the sender and the MTA associated with any of the recipients" (Kucherauw: e.g., explicitly discloses and illustrates an intermediate device separate comprising one or more MTAs, such as a 'Mass-Mail Accelerator' \_430, comprising a plurality MTAs\_520, and grouped / categorized according to a 'domain' {i.e., AOL.com Domain}, and wherein the plurality of MTAs\_520 are different than the MTA associated with the sender {MTA\_420} and the MTA associated with a recipient / target) [Figs. 4 & 5] [0042-0046].

It would thus be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combination of Nielsen and Leonard with the above additional feature, as disclosed by Kucherauw, for the motivation of providing an improved methodology for processing automated email messages sent to numerous recipients [Kucherauw: 0004], as well as an email system that implements parallel processing for mass mailings, with as much resource sharing and re-use, and as little disk I/O, as possible [Kucherauw: 0036].

Additionally, while the combination of Nielsen and Leonard and Kucherawy discloses substantial features of the invention, including “a message transfer agent associated with each of said users for sending the e-mail when said user acts as a sender and delivering the e-mail when said user acts as a recipient, and wherein each MTA includes a cancel mailbox”, as above, the combination does not explicitly disclose the added feature of the system further comprising “the intermediate MTA including a cancel mailbox different than the cancel mailbox of the MTA associated with the sender and the cancel mailbox of the MTA associated with any of the recipients, the cancel mailbox of the intermediate MTA receiving the cancellation message from the MTA associated with the sender and, in response, transmitting the cancellation message to the MTA associated with each recipient”. Nonetheless, the said feature is expressly disclosed by Lewis in a related endeavor.

Lewis discloses as his invention a system and method for password protecting a subscriber-created distribution list in a wireless network. The method includes receiving a subscriber-created password and a distribution list of a plurality of destination addresses, storing the distribution list and the subscriber-created password in a data structure within the wireless network, associating the subscriber-created password with the distribution list, and limiting access to the distribution list based on the subscriber-created password [Abstract] [Fig. 35] [col 2, L24-54]. In particular, Lewis discloses the added feature of the system further comprising “the intermediate MTA including a cancel mailbox different than the cancel mailbox of the MTA associated with the sender and the cancel mailbox of the MTA associated with any of the recipients, the cancel

mailbox of the intermediate MTA receiving the cancellation message from the MTA associated with the sender and, in response, transmitting the cancellation message to the MTA associated with each recipient" (Lewis: e.g., explicitly discloses and illustrates an intermediate Message Transfer Gateway device {MTG\_170} comprising Message Transfer Agent \_2420 and coupled to various devices including DART1\_145a) [Fig. 24] [col 7, L35-41] (e.g., expressly teaches that "DARTs, such as DART1\_145a / DART2\_145b may be capable of allowing a user to remotely delete email from a wireless device. In this manner, a wireless subscriber may be able to access his wireless device and be able to 'delete', for example, an email message"... "DART 145a may receive a 'delete command' from a wireless subscriber and may be able 'to delete a particular message' from devices such as MDS 150a as well as from an IMAP / POP server 156. In this manner, DART 145a may be capable of 'synchronized delete function'..." [col 19, L1-20 & L38-52] (e.g., "a wireless subscriber may access 'a message that has already been sent to a destination' and can, for example, resend, forward, query or 'delete' this message..." [col 22, L60 – col 23, L5].

It would thus be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combination of Nielsen, Leonard and Kucherawy with the above additional feature, as disclosed by Lewis, for the motivation of providing system and method that provides increased access to a messaging system, and which also provides an improved set of functions with which customers may be able to interact with the system [Lewis: col 2, L1-20].

As per claim 5, Nielsen discloses a process according to claim 4, wherein a cancel mailbox of a MTA associated with each recipient sends back via an intermediate MTA an acknowledgement message (e.g., confirmation message) of a first type if said recipient has not yet read said e-mail (1011 / 1021) [Fig. 10a] (1117 / 1111) [Fig. 11a]..

As per claim 6, Nielsen discloses process according to claim 5, wherein the cancel mailbox of the MTA associated with several recipients sends back via an intermediate MTA a first type message to said sender MTA if none of these recipients has already read said e-mail (e.g., confirmation message) (1011 / 1021) [Fig. 10a] (1117 / 1111) [Fig. 11a].

As per claim 7, Nielsen discloses the process according to claim 6, wherein said step d) comprises sending from the cancel mailbox of said sender MTA a message via an intermediate MTA to the cancel mailboxes of the MTAs associated with all the recipients addressed in said e-mail requesting each cancel mailbox to delete said e-mail (e.g., "Informing Recipient to Cancel the Message") [Fig. 6c].

As per claim 8, Nielsen discloses the process according to claim 7, wherein said step d) further comprises the step of sending a message from said cancel mailboxes of the MTAs associated with all recipients to the recipient mailboxes in order to delete said e-mail (e.g., "Informing Recipient to Cancel the Message") [Fig. 6c].

As per claim 9, Nielsen discloses the process according to claim 7, wherein the cancel



mailbox of said sender MTA sends a first type acknowledgment message to the mailbox of said sender to confirm that said e-mail has been deleted (e.g., confirmation message) (1011 / 1021) [Fig. 10a] (1117 / 1111) [Fig. 11a].

As per claim 10, Nielsen discloses the process according to claim 4, wherein a cancel mailbox of a MTA associated with a recipient sends back via an intermediate MTA an acknowledgment message of a second type if said recipient has already read said e-mail (e.g., confirmation message) (1011 / 1021) [Fig. 10a] (1117 / 1111) [Fig. 11a] [col 4, L38-42].

As per claim 11, Nielsen discloses the process according to claim 10, wherein the cancel mailbox of the MTA associated with several recipients sends back via an intermediate MTA a second type message to said sender MTA if at least one of these recipients has already read said e-mail (e.g., confirmation message) (1011 / 1021) [Fig. 10a] (1117 / 1111) [Fig. 11a] [col 4, L38-42].

As per claim 12, Nielsen discloses the process according to claim 11, wherein said step d) comprises sending from the cancel mailbox of said sender MTA a message via an intermediate MTA to the cancel mailboxes of the MTAs associated with the recipients who have not yet read said e-mail requesting not to delete said e-mail (513 / 623) [Figs. 5 & 6c].

As per claim 13, Nielsen discloses the process according to claim 12, wherein said step d) further comprises the step of sending a message from said cancel mailboxes of the MTAs associated with the recipients who have not yet read said e-mail to the mailboxes of said recipients in order not to delete said e-mail (513 / 623) [Figs. 5 & 6c].

As per claim 14, Nielsen discloses the process according to claim 12, wherein the cancel mailbox of said sender MTA sends a second type acknowledgment message to the mailbox of said sender to confirm that said e-mail has not been deleted (e.g., confirmation message) [Figs. 9 & 10a].

As per claim 16, while Nielsen discloses substantial features of the invention such as the system of claim 1, the added feature of the process wherein at least one of said recipients is addressed by an alias, the cancel mailbox of the MTA receiving said alias being adapted to send a request to an associated domain name server (DNS) in order to obtain the address corresponding to said alias is disclosed by Leonard in a related endeavor.

Leonard discloses as his invention an electronic mail system and method in which the originator or sender may control the lifespan of the message, so that the message, and all copies of the messages everywhere in the world, disappear at an appropriate time [col 9, L10-15]. In particular, Leonard discloses the added feature of the process wherein at least one of said recipients is addressed by an alias, the cancel mailbox of the MTA receiving said alias being adapted to send a request to an

associated domain name server (DNS) in order to obtain the address corresponding to said alias [col 1, L60-62] [col 5, L40 – col 6, L10] (e.g., DNS registration system and 'assigned' recipient address or alias address) [col 15, L37 – col 16, L10]. As disclosed and taught by Leonard, a 'recipient' of the electronic messaging or mail system may be embodied as an 'individual recipient' or a 'group of recipients', the electronic mail system tracking information concerning the usage (i.e., message 'read' and/or 'deleted') and handling of the message by all recipients.

It would thus be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine and/or modify Nielsen's invention with the above added feature, as disclosed by Leonard, for the motivation of providing an electronic mail system and method that enables the originator of a message sent by the electronic mail to select a date, time, or event at which the message and all incarnations of the message to self-destruct regardless of the number and types of computers or software systems that may have interacted with the message, and/or to include processing and handling limitations [Abstract].

### ***Conclusion***

1. The Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It

is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

2. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Glenford Madamba whose telephone number is 571-272-7989. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on 571-272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/John Follansbee/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2451

Glenford Madamba  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2451

